

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter – Auditorium

101 8th Street, Oakland, California

October 5, 2011

Members Present:

Susan Adams, Supervisor, County of Marin, ABAG Vice President
Andy Barnes, Policy Chair, Urban Land Institute
Shiloh Ballard, Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Ronit Bryant, Councilmember, City of Mountain View
Paul Campos, Sr. Vice President of Government Affairs, BIA Bay Area
Linda Craig, League of Women Voters Bay Area
Diane Dillon, Supervisor, County of Napa
Pat Eklund, Councilmember, City of Novato
Rose Jacobs Gibson, Supervisor, County of San Mateo/ABAG Immediate Past President
Mark Green, Mayor, City of Union City/ABAG President
Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club
Janet Kennedy, Councilmember, City of Martinez
Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Director of Government Affairs, City of San Francisco
Nate Miley, Supervisor, County of Alameda
Jeremy Madsen, Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance
Ross Mirkarimi, Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
Julie Pierce, Vice Mayor, City of Clayton
Harry Price, Mayor, City of Fairfield
Tiffany Renee, Councilmember, City of Petaluma
A. Sepi Richardson, Councilmember, City of Brisbane/RPC Vice Chair
Mark Ross, Councilmember, City of Martinez
Pixie Hayward Schickele, California Teachers Association
Linda Seifert, Supervisor, County of Solano
Carol Severin, EBRPD Board of Directors
Allen Fernandez Smith, President & CEO, Urban Habitat
Jim Spering, Supervisor, County of Solano
Egon Terplan, Regional Planning Director, SPUR
Gayle Uilkema, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa
Beth Walukas, Alameda County Transportation Commission

Members Absent:

Valerie Brown, Supervisor, County of Sonoma
Dave Cortese, Supervisor, County of Santa Clara/RPC Chair
Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor, City of Pleasanton
Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council
Nancy Nadel, Councilmember, City of Oakland
Anu Natarajan, Councilmember, City of Fremont
Laurel Prevetti, Bay Area Planning Directors Association (BAPDA)

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Staff Present:

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director
Miriam Chion, ABAG Principal Planner
Marisa Raya, ABAG Regional Planner
Dayle Farina, ABAG Administrative Assistant

Alix Bockelman, MTC Programming & Allocations Director
Jennifer Yeamans, MTC Planner

1. Call to Order/Introductions

- Vice Chair Richardson called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.
Vice Chair Richardson welcomed new Committee Members Tiffany Renee, Councilmember, City of Petaluma; Allen Fernandez Smith, President & CEO, Urban Habitat; and Linda Craig, League of Women Voters Bay Area.

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes for August 3, 2011 Meeting.

Approval of the minutes was moved by Committee Member Eklund and seconded by Committee Member Kirshner-Rodriguez.

Minutes of August 3, 2011, were approved as submitted.

4. Oral Reports/Comments

A. Committee Members

Vice Chair Richardson reported on the Resilience Council, which met just prior to this meeting, and described what is happening/will happen going forward. She encouraged additional RPC members to participate.

B. Staff

Ken Kirkey described the process for moving Growth Opportunity Areas (GOA) to Priority Development Areas (PDA), approved by the ABAG Executive Board at their last meeting. In addition, he provided an overview of new Place Types approved by the Executive Board.

5. INFORMATION: Sustainable Communities Strategy – Alternative Land Use Scenarios

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, provided an overview of the land use patterns for the Core Concentration, Focused Growth and Outer Bay Area Growth Scenarios, encompassing a range of housing and employment distribution patterns across places and cities that support equitable and sustainable development.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Adams asked about the projection of job growth and how the data related to limited employment in recent decades.

Mr. Kirkey explained that the data is based on initial analysis indicating that the Bay Area can expect this level of growth because of the region's strengths relative to key sectors. He also explained that the SCS is a strategy, with realistic assumptions. The region's success relative to remaining competitive is in part related to strengthening the region's infrastructure and providing housing in key locations, the charge of the SCS/RTP.

Committee Member Holtzclaw asked if the Walnut Creek BART station area was considered when looking at areas in the inner bay area with low auto ownership/low vehicle miles traveled.

Mr. Kirkey explained the process by which the data was concluded for the "Inner Bay Area".

Committee Member Haggerty commented that the term "Outer Bay Area" seemed to suggest that some parts of the region were less important and believed that it should be changed. Mr. Kirkey responded that the terminology "Inner Bay Area" and "Outer Bay Area" were developed as an organizing framework.

Committee Member Pierce added that there are community representatives from jurisdictions in Contra Costa County who also believe that the terminology is exclusive. City of Oakley and City of Brentwood were the heavy housing producers for a couple of decades and now they'd like to bring the jobs to where the houses are. She suggested that we develop terms for use in the SCS that are objective and do not distract from the intent of the SCS.

Committee Member Spering commented that we also need to include in the discussion how we are going to invest in the region? He described that as a region we need to consider how to invest in the non- "urban core" as well as when and how do we make the linkage to the industrial and agricultural areas in Napa, Sonoma and Solano Counties. He further stated that if we're going to make zoning law changes, there needs to be incentive programs.

Committee Member Eklund asked for clarification on the calculation of "net low income commuters" referred to in the presentation. In addition she commented on the high level of the employment growth projection in response to the announcement from analysts stating that California will be at the low end of the economic recovery.

Mr. Kirkey responded first to Ms. Eklund's comment on the job growth numbers; The analysis of consultants with whom ABAG is working on this issue suggests that the Bay Area is expected to do much better economically than most of California, a trend that is now well underway in some parts of the region.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Miriam Chion, ABAG Principal Planner addressed Ms. Eklund's request for clarification on the “net low income commuters” calculation. The calculation was factored by taking the workers who make \$30,000 or less and subtracted the in-commute from the out-commute.

Committee Member Madsen asked: 1) How are the unconstrained scenarios going to be analyzed going forward? 2) How are we going to put all of these scenarios into one preferred scenario? 3) How does the 15% reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) per capita by 2035 factor in as a guideline and principle in putting together the scenario?

Mr. Kirkey responded that all of the scenarios, which will be released in early December, will be measured against the performance targets that were adopted by MTC & ABAG. The feedback received from the RPC, other policy committees, jurisdictions and from the public will be used to develop a draft preferred scenario.

Committee Member Fernandez-Smith commented that we have noted the growth in the knowledge-based job sector and asked if we've heard of other sectors that are on the growth trajectory in the region. He wants to make sure that the other sectors get the attention for growth that the knowledge-based sector receives, particularly sectors that provide jobs for residents without college degrees.

Committee Member Dillon commented that there needs to be a factor in the scenario for growth which states how we want to develop housing and how we're going to fund transportation which will address the “outer-bay” concerns for transportation dollars. Ms. Dillon also expressed concern over the “low-income commuter” factor and how that is being calculated between neighboring cities/towns.

Committee Member Terplan commented that the investment issues and the inner and outer-bay issues are both excellent targets and very complicated when you break down the transportation dollars and feels they need to be looked at very closely.

6. INFORMATION: OneBayArea Grant Proposal

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director introduced Alix Bockelman, MTC Programming and Allocations Director, who presented a proposal for and sought input on the One Bay Area Grant Program, which would better integrate the region's federal transportation program funding with land-use and housing policies by providing incentives that support the production of the housing and related transportation investments.

Committee Member Ross asked that, given the fact that the cities are producing the housing and the Congestion Management Agencies (CMA) (counties) are receiving the funding, how will it be determined that the CMAs will give the money to the jurisdictions.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Ms. Bockelman responded that the proposal is that CMAs oversee the distribution of funds to the counties, but that the 70% requirement to Priority Development Areas (PDA) should ensure that the cities receive the appropriate funding.

Committee Member Adams asked: 1) From which part of MTC dollars is this “new pot” coming? 2) Ms. Adams asked for clarification on if the money is coming from existing resources which would result in take funding away from other already-underfunded projects.

Ms. Bockelman responded that some of the money is coming from Federal STP and CMAQ funds. Some of the money is being taken from programs which decided at the regional level (e.g., Regional TLC and Regional Bike program). Now that money is proposed to go to the counties directly for decision-making.

Committee Member Kennedy expressed concern over the way the formula works. She expressed additional concern about housing and whether jurisdictions would be penalized for not producing housing in a weak real estate market.

Committee Member Green related that, on conversation with other jurisdictions it was recommended that the 70% PDA requirement may be too high and that it more of a gradual increase to 70% over a specific period of time may be most workable.

Committee Member Madsen expressed concern over funding going to the right places. In addition, if he understands the breakdown of funds, the concern over dollars being lost could be a misconception.

Vice Chair Richardson proposed bringing this item back before taking it to the Joint MTC Planning/ABAG Administrative Committee for adoption.

Committee Member Kirshner-Rodriguez commented that it may be helpful to understand what the administrative and oversight role of the CMAs will be.

7. INFORMATION: Sustainable Communities Strategy – Equity Analysis

Marisa Raya, ABAG Regional Planner, and Jennifer Yeamans, MTC Planner, provided an overview of the Equity Analysis for the Alternative and Preferred Scenarios. The analysis, including the definition of equity performance measures and target populations for analysis, was developed based on input from the Equity Working Group.

Committee Member Holtzclaw commented that he believed commuter time which is walking/bike trips to/from the workplace or to transit should not be counted as commute time.

Committee Member Kirshner-Rodriguez asked how the “What’s changed since 2000” (minority & population) is relative to the state and other regions in the state.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Ms. Yeamans responded that she doesn't have those numbers, specifically. However, she noted that the press has reported that California and the Bay Area are doing better than the rest of the country relative to poverty and concentration of poverty measures. That said, there has been a net decrease in people who are not low income.

Committee Member Terplan asked why transit use and the location near transit weren't included as one of the performance metrics. Mr. Terplan also asked what is meant by VMT density.

Ms. Yeamans responded that VMT density relates to how many vehicle miles of travel are taking place over a given spatial area in a community. This has been used in the past as a measure of emissions. "Communities of Concern" is a spatial definition so we need to know how much of the VMT is occurring in a given space.

Committee Member Eklund asked for an explanation on why senior citizens ages 75 and above are included in the equity analysis.

Ms. Yeamans commented that: 1) In response to a request by the MTC Policy Advisory Council to incorporate older adults and people with disabilities into the equity analysis, which has historically focused on people of color and low income residents. 2) To focus in on communities where there are more seniors over the age of 75 when people are more likely to stop driving and face mobility challenges.

Committee Member Green asked why there are wide variations on the percentage of regional population among the proposed measures. He stated that the description makes it seem as if these 8 points have been weighted.

Ms. Yeamans responded that the thresholds are established where there is round number that can be ascertained between the mean and 1 standard deviation above. They are not intended to be weighted but easily communicated.

Committee Member Fernandez Smith commented that he was happy to see the multipliers being considered. He added that he is intrigued to see renters and rental housing being added into the equation of affordable housing.

ADJOURN:

Vice Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for December 7, 2011

Submitted by:

Dayle Farina

Administrative Assistant